

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUN 14 2004

F A X

.....
•
• **Innovision Research**
• P.O. Box 382174
• Memphis, TN 38183-2174
•
•
•
•
•
•
•

OFFICIAL

To: Stephen Johnson USPTO (Business Fax)

Fax number: 1 703 872-9326

From: John Simmons

Fax number: (270) 717-0867

Business phone: 901 753-2335

Home phone:

Date & Time: 6/14/2004 10:17:07 AM

Pages: 6

Re: 10/080,094

Dear Mr. Johnson,

After our phone conversation, I attempted to structure some changes to satisfy the difficulties. It seems that it may be practical to withdraw your first grouping (Claims 1-4) and place them in a Continuation in Part. Claims 5-8 could be withdrawn and replaced by something like the claims below. 9 could be withdrawn and abandoned.

However, I need to ask a question about this. Proposed new claims 10 and 11 are exactly identical to each other except for the short subparagraph in each that begins with "a leveraging means". Both claims identically describe a moving, potentially Sabot-like carrier that impacts an anchored element whose carrier-provided energy (from the heavy carrier – none from the projectile itself) is instantly and transmissively redirected upon impact and passed through some (any) leveraging means to the back of the projectile "on-the-fly".

This carrier-mass-energy-redirection-upon-impact for additive acceleration process is, in large part, what seems unique. That is because it overcomes the unyielding gas-expansion-rate-limited ceilings on maximum velocity by converting the energy of the rapidly moving carrier itself to additively (that's the hard part because the projectile is moving very rapidly already) boost the velocity. However, the form of leverage the controlled impact's redirected/re-used and carrier-mass-provided force passes through is almost incidental since any form of lever (even including pulleys) would work.

Claim 10 applies classic levers to the impact force redirection and 11-12 apply the leverage in the carrier itself (so you don't have to cut a hole in the barrel for an external lever, etc.) with 12 documenting several hydraulic leveraging forms.

My remaining question may seem stupid but, not having a patent attorney, your response would help very much. I'll call you and promise to keep it brief.

Thanks,
John (drafts of new claims below)